REMARKS

While Applicants elect Group II, claims 1-10 and 15-18 as well as elect Species 1, corresponding to claims 1-10, Applicants submit the following.

Generally speaking, it is believed that Species 1 (claims 1-10) and Species 4 (claim 17) are basically directed to the same point. In particular, as shown in Fig. 10, second oxide film 17 functions as a protection film (see specification page 24, lines 17-23). Accordingly, a new claim 22 has been drafted to be generic to Species 1 and 4 as well as to newly drafted claim 19. Dependent claims have been written depending upon independent claim 22 that are directed to the features of claims 1, 17 and 19.

In addition, new claim 27 has been written as a generic claim covering Species 1 and 4 as well as newly presented claims 19 and 22.

Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-10, 17 and 19-31 should be examined together. Examination is hereby requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Shrinath Mayur

Registration No. 34,663 Attorney for Applicants

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR 1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370 Alexandria, Virginia 22314 (703) 684-1120

Date: August 4, 2003